

2-1



MINUTES

San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

Bob Roos
Doreen Liberto-Blanck
Penny Rappa
Eugene Mehlschau
Sarah Christie

MEETING LOCATION AND SCHEDULE

Regular Planning Commission meetings are held in the Board of Supervisors Chambers, County Government Center, San Luis Obispo, on the second and fourth Thursdays of each month. Regular Adjourned Meetings are held when deemed necessary. The Regular Meeting schedule is as follows:

Meeting Begins:	8:45 a.m.
Morning Recess:	10:00 - 10:15 a.m.
Noon Recess:	12:00 - 1:30 p.m.
Afternoon Recess:	3:00 - 3:15 p.m.

ALL HEARINGS ARE ADVERTISED FOR 8:45 A.M. HOWEVER, HEARINGS GENERALLY PROCEED IN THE ORDER LISTED. THIS TIME IS ONLY AN ESTIMATE AND IS NOT TO BE CONSIDERED AS TIME GUARANTEED. THE PUBLIC AND APPLICANTS ARE ADVISED TO ARRIVE EARLY.

MEETING DATE: THURSDAY, MAY 12, 2005

DRAFT *** DRAFT ***** Wording could change upon approval ***** DRAFT ***** DRAFT**

PRESENT: Commissioners Bob Roos, Sarah Christie, Gene Mehlschau, Penny Rappa, Chairperson Doreen Liberto-Blanck

ABSENT: None

STAFF: Warren Hoag, Current Planning
Matt Janssen, Current Planning
Kami Griffin, Planner
John Nall, Environmental Specialist
Karen Nall, Planner
Brian Pedrotti, Planner
Stephanie Fuhs, Planner
Marsha Lee, Planner

OTHERS: Richard Marshall, Public Works
Jim Orton, County Counsel
Tim McNulty, County Counsel

The meeting is called to order by Chairperson Liberto-Blanck.

The following action minutes are listed as they were acted upon by the Planning Commission and as listed on the agenda for the Regular Meeting of May 12, 2005, together with the maps and staff reports attached thereto and incorporated therein by reference.

Speaker	Note
Call to Order	
Roll Call	All present.

1-2

Flag Salute	
Public Comment Period	Members of the public wishing to address the Commission on matters other than scheduled items may do so at this time, when recognized by the Chairman. Presentations are limited to three minutes per individual.
Eric Greening	States Environmental Health and others should look at current inventory countywide of septic tanks, and the rate at which new homes and businesses are being built that depend on them, and how often do they need pumping or fail. Discusses fast development recently and reasons, ramifications. Discusses Rural Planned Development ordinance and TDC's. States ultimately when a septic tank fails, sewage pollution happens. Where it is hauled is important. Contents of 4,700 septic tanks in Los Osos will be decommissioned within 2 years, and a location for dumping is required. Wishes to know plan. A study session is requested for this topic.
Warren Hoag, staff	Reminder regarding advisory councils training workshop Saturday at Community Room, County Library. Commissioner Roos will be the main speaker. States the issues raised by Mr. Greening will be discussed with Environmental Health Department and reported back to this Commission.
Commissioner Roos	States a future discussion of wind generation machines was a topic requested to be discussed, and this should be added to the list of study sessions, with staff responding.
Commissioner Christie	States she discussed standards for Agriculture to Agriculture transfers in the TDC program, and the Agriculture Commissioner's representative said the department had not yet been approached, and requests staff input on when recommendations may be made public, with staff responding public review is expected for early summer, and Agriculture Commissioner's office will be contacted immediately.
Bonaire Investments / Sprint PCS, County File No. DRC2004-00008	This being the time set for continued hearing from 4/28/05 to consider a request by BONAIRE INVESTMENTS / SPRINT PCS for a Development Plan/Coastal Development Permit to allow the construction and operation of an unmanned wireless telecommunications facility consisting of 3 panel antennas within a 50-foot high, 14 inch diameter flagpole, and associated equipment within the basement of an existing building. The project will result in the disturbance of approximately 500 square feet of an approximately 1.7 acre parcel. The project is within the Office & Professional land use category and is located at 1337 Los Osos Valley Road at the intersection of South Bay Boulevard, in the community of Los Osos. The site is in the Estero Planning Area. Also to be considered at the hearing will be approval of the Environmental Document prepared in accordance with the applicable provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq. Mitigation measures are proposed to address visual and cultural issues. County File Number: DRC2004-00008. Supervisorial District 2. APN: 074-314-011. Date Accepted: February 8, 2005.
Marsha Lee, staff	Gives background of continuance. States several comments have been received since the last meeting, all supporting project denial. Clarifies an error, stating the revised project is 50 feet high and reduced to 14 inches in diameter. Discusses subject matter of public comment, mostly visual and RF frequencies.
Commissioner Christie	Requests comment by County Counsel regarding circumstances under which this Commission may deny this project, with County Counsel responding.
Tricia Knight, Sprint PCS	Distributes photographs to Commissioners. Discusses existing structures already

	built throughout the county, and discusses the Laetitia Winery facility, which is much bigger. Discusses other locations, comparing them to this project. Discusses coverage area, search area, coverage holes, and dbm's. States the reason they cannot locate outside Los Osos is that Sprint's transmissions are shorter wavelength, and explains the effects of that compared to other carriers'. Summarizes conformance with Local Coastal Plan, and answers questions raised at previous meeting.
Commissioner Roos	Requests clarification from applicant regarding photographs distributed, and whether less than 14 inches diameter is possible, with applicant responding.
Gaurav Kumar, Sprint PCS, RF Engineer	States the size cables must be and how it affects the diameter necessary to house the cables within the flagpole.
Commissioner Roos and Mr. Kumar	Discuss details regarding Mr. Kumar's statements and what diameter flagpoles can be.
Commissioner Rappa	Requests further clarification of reasons why shared facilities are not being considered, and whether the future promises underground transmission facilities, with Mr. Kumar responding.
Commissioner Christie	Requests Ms. Knight further clarify meaning of the maps distributed, and how likely it is that Sprint will need to erect another tower in downtown Los Osos in the future, with Ms. Knight responding.
Commissioners, and applicant's representatives	Discuss where equipment will be located, the additional diameter required, whether equipment can be located closer to the pole, the desires of the building owner where the pole is to be placed.
Leon Van Beurden, Bonaire Investments, applicant	States this project has been in the works three years, and many restrictions on what could be done have been experienced. Discusses the building and parking lot and how redesign would not work for Sprint PCS. States aesthetics are important, and the equipment will require 120 square feet approximately to house the equipment. Redesign as suggested by Commissioners is not possible on this site, and gives reasons.
Chairperson Liberto-Blanck	Requests clarification of images in photographs distributed by Ms. Knight as well as uses of surrounding properties, with Ms. Knight responding.
Commissioner Rappa	States she has watched the videotape and has read all the materials made available to the Commission and so is qualified to vote on this project today.
Lee Caulfield	Submits a petition with 84 signatures of people who are opposed to the cell tower being built at the location proposed. States she lives in Los Osos. Requests denial of this project and a moratorium. Cites recent court cases that she feels should be consulted. States the location is unsuitable and gives reasons. States the tower is unnecessary and undesirable, will be visible from Los Osos Valley Road. States Commissioners should visit site, and that the temporary pole is not as large as the one proposed. States she disputes the findings, and gives reasons. States the community does not want or need this tower.
Julie Tacker	Refers to correspondence sent earlier this week. Requests denial of project, stating it will set precedent, and that the representative has today indicated it is likely additional towers will be needed. States radio frequencies may not be sufficient for denial, but Environmental Health should look at the issue, or the Board of Supervisors should look at this. States cell towers are incompatible with

L-4

	communities. Encourages denial of project based on visual impacts.
Carol Maurer, Los Osos, Chairperson, Los Osos Community Advisory Council	States she has a summary of all comments by LOCAC and provides Chair a copy of those comments. Gives background regarding LOCAC review of this project, stating not all members were present that evening. States only few community members were present because notice wasn't given of this project being discussed, and the vote was 5 to 2 in favor. However, this came back again before LOCAC because of a design changes. A new board was put in place later on, and decisions made regarding how the public would be alerted. The project was voted on again, and lost on a vote of 2 to 9. That vote led to the story pole, which was up for about 2 weeks. The public responded via email, and the were polled. 31.9% wanted no tower at all. 45.5% of the emails were not pleased with the project, but willing to "live with it" assuming it was minimized as much as possible. The rest approved of the project as presented. This led to a tie vote of LOCAC with one abstention.
Commissioners and Ms. Maurer	Discuss the votes of LOCAC just discussed, with Ms. Maurer responding.
Linde Owen, Los Osos	States this project will set precedent, and proliferation of cell towers in Los Osos is not desired. Wonders if the building owner shouldn't have considered this project location long ago, since he stated this morning he anticipated this project at the time his building was built. States it is visually unpleasing and the addition of a flag at the top adds to the distastefulness of this. Wishes a county-wide ordinance to guide cell tower development.
Diane Anderson's letter, read by Linde Owen.	Opposed to project. States she is cell phone user who has had good service already with existing facilities.
Eric Greening	Discusses preemption, stating it is not absolute, and that the Commission is required to seek information on all aspects of this project. States if significant impacts cannot be mitigated, an EIR is required, and if it applies, not doing the project may be required. States a smaller wavelength is higher energy. Further, states that any electromagnetic radiation increases by inverse square of distance. Wonders how much closer it is to the nearest residence, stating the impact is the square of the distance. Gives examples. States the Commission is required to consider the impact on biological resources of this radiation. Discusses that an American flag must be lit all night, which is an impact.
Commissioner Roos	Discusses the mathematic issues raised by Mr. Greening, correcting Mr. Greening's statements regarding the electromagnetic radiation, distances and wavelength.
Commissioners and staff	Discuss possible alternatives.
Leon Van Beurden, Bonaire Investments, applicant	Discusses how his company came to agree to have this cell tower located on his property. Discusses that flagpoles are allowed on commercial property. States redesign to locate the vault elsewhere is almost impossible.
Commissioners and Mr. Van Beurden	Discuss what kind of flag will fly, and when; whether the community prefers no flag at all, and that a condition is on this project that a flag will be flown every day. Further discussion takes place regarding why the equipment must be placed so far from the flagpole.
Tricia Knight, Sprint / PCS	States they have done much research before proposing this project. States many customers have complained about lack of service in the area to be served by the

L-5

	proposed poles. Requests approval.
MOTION	The matter is fully discussed, and thereafter, motion by Commissioner Christie, seconded by Chairperson Liberto-Blanck, to deny the Development Plan/Coastal Development Permit based on the Finding that it does not adequately implement the Local Coastal Plan provisions and is inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood and will be growth inducing and will spawn future need for future towers, fails on vote of 2 for to 3 against.
MOTION	The matter is further discussed, and thereafter, motion by Commissioner Roos, seconded by Commissioner Mehlschau, carries, with Commissioner Christie and Chairperson Liberto-Blanck voting no, to adopt the mitigated Negative Declaration in accordance with the applicable provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq., and RESOLUTION NO. 2005-013 granting a Development Plan/Coastal Development Permit to BONAIRE INVESTMENTS / SPRINT PCS for the above referenced item, based on the Findings in Exhibit A, and subject to the Conditions in Exhibit B, with the following changes: in Condition 1.a., change "14" to "12"; and in Condition 1.f., change "shall" to "may", adopted.
2. CAROLINE SEJERA, County File No. G030009F	This being the time set for hearing to consider a request by Caroline Sejera for 1) an amendment to the South County (Inland) Area Plan of the Land Use Element by changing the land use category on an approximately 1.5-acre portion of a 30-acre parcel from Agriculture to Residential Rural, and 2) an amendment to the Agriculture and Open Space Element land use map by changing the land use designation from Agriculture to Small Lot Rural. The site is located on the east side of Highway 101, approximately 1,400 feet north of the Los Berros/Thompson Road highway interchange. The site is in the South County (Inland) Planning Area. Also to be considered at the hearing will be approval of the Negative Declaration for the item, prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq. Mitigation measures are proposed to address Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Hazards/Hazardous Materials, Noise, Public Services/Utilities, Recreation, Transportation/Circulation, Wastewater, Water, and Land Use. County File No: G030009F . APN: 090-042-017. Supervisorial District: 4.
Commissioner Mehlschau	States he must recuse himself due to possible conflict of interest, and departs.
Brian Pedrotti, staff	Gives the staff report. Discusses major issues, providing additional information regarding conversion of agricultural to residential land; that the adjacent agriculture operations to the northwest are irrigated row crops, and states Agriculture Commissioner's office has reviewed and made comments. Recommends adoption of Negative Declaration and approval of project.
Commissioners	Requests clarification regarding number of traffic trips and how it affects this subdivision and the need for a General Plan Amendment, with staff responding. Further discusses level of severity of water resources, with staff responding. Biological resources and full avoidance of same is discussed, with staff responding.
John Nall, staff	States staff will respond following some analysis of the full avoidance mitigation measure shown on page 2-22 of the negative declaration.
Tim McNulty, County	Discusses that whether mitigations are "real" or simply require a study with

Counsel	unknown results is an issue that must be dealt with often. Comments on legal implications of the biological resources mitigation measure that requires total avoidance if sensitive resources are found. Discusses Planning Area standards. Discusses that implementation must be possible for mitigations required.
Commissioners, County Counsel and staff	Discuss details regarding mitigation measures and how these apply specifically to this project. If sensitive species are discovered, applicant agrees to full avoidance and to not doing any construction in that area. Some sensitive species were found on the site, and more study must be done to determine whether there are sensitive plant species present because of the time of year when the study was done. Whether a planning area standard is appropriate is discussed. The matter of biological resources and protection is thoroughly discussed.
Shane Hernandez, on behalf of applicant	States this parcel is 30 acres and has been in the family 30 years. States the plan is to eventually make 5-acre parcels and the rest of the land will be used for family to live on. States they are sensitive to their surroundings and do not plan to "take everything down." States they talked with county fire department and can satisfy all requirements. States the portion of the property being discussed today has never been used for agriculture.
Commissioners and Mr. Hernandez	Discuss the site location, access, road improvements, slopes, fire danger.
Eric Greening	States biological resources are being considered only on the acres requiring zone change, but it has been stated the ultimate plan for the 30 acres is to subdivide. Therefore, considering biological resources on just the 1-1/2 acre parcel is inadequate. Discusses the agricultural buffer. Future development of 6 five-acre parcel will likely impact the drip lines of trees and other resources. States many performing parts of the ecosystem that are important to wildlife including cover will be cleared. Wonders about the high pressure pipeline that crosses the Los Berros Creek, and wonders if there are above ground structures and whether access will be available.
Hernandez, applicant	States probably only 4 parcels will be able to be created. Discusses access. States applicant's willingness to do whatever is necessary to avoid biological impacts.
Commissioners, Public Works, applicant and staff	Discuss length of the cul-de-sac, the number of parcels that will ultimately result and whether a condition can be added limiting future subdivision to four parcels, or five parcels, the type and kind of structures that can be allowed.
Kami Griffin, staff	Reads into record changes to paragraph 13.a.1.
MOTION	The matter is thoroughly discussed, and thereafter, motion by Commissioner Roos, seconded by Commissioner Rappa, and carried, with Commissioner Mehlschau recused, to adopt the mitigated Negative Declaration in accordance with the applicable provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq., and RESOLUTION NO. 2005-014 , recommending to the Board of Supervisors that the Land Use Element and Land Use Ordinance of the County of San Luis Obispo General Plan be amended, based on Findings A through E, as presented, and with the following changes: correct project location description on page 2-9 to read: "The site is located on the east side of Highway 101, approximately 1,400 feet north of the Los Berros / Thompson Road highway interchange." Replace 13.a.1. with the following: "Any subdivision of the parcel as shown in Figure 112-36 shall be no more than a

L-7

	maximum of 5 parcels. New 13.a.2. At the time of land division application building sites shall be shown on the tentative map. The building sites shall a) avoid any sensitive and special status plant and animal species through the preparation of a comprehensive biological survey report prepared by a county approved biologist; b) be located in the least visible portions of the site as shown through a visual study prepared by a county approved visual consultant; and c) be outside of the 60 dba or less areas as shown in the Noise Element." Existing 13.a.2 would become 13.a.3., 13.a.3. would become 13.a.4 and be modified to say "within a range of 250 to 500 feet" and 13.a.4. would become 13.a.5. The figure would be changed to include the entire parent parcel. As part of 13.a.2 after a), b), and c) it will say "all development shall be located within building sites."
Commissioner Mehlschau	Is now present.
3. ZWINGER, County File No. SUB2004-00116	This being the time set for hearing to consider a proposal by THOMAS AND DORIE ZWINGER to reconsider the conditions of approval for Tract 1678 to adjust the originally approved construction control line and building envelope for Lot 1 of Tract 1678 to allow the construction of a 1,200 square foot secondary dwelling on a 6.5 acre parcel. The project is located at 125 Pioneer Circle, approximately 300 feet north of the Lopez Drive/Corralitos Road intersection, approximately three miles east of the City of Arroyo Grande, in the San Luis Bay (Inland) planning area. Also to be considered at the hearing will be approval of the Negative Declaration prepared for the item pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., and CA Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq. Mitigation measures are proposed to address Geology, Public Services and Utilities, and Wastewater. County File No: SUB 2004-00116. APN: 047-200-006. Supervisorial District: 4. Date Accepted: November 30, 2004.
Stephanie Fuhs, staff	Gives the staff report. Discusses building envelopes, visibility from Lopez Drive, drainage and erosion control, landscaping, Recommends adoption of the negative declaration and approval of the reconsideration.
Commissioner Christie	Requests clarification of how a secondary dwelling would be treated and how septic system would be handled, with staff responding. Further discussion takes place regarding size of existing dwelling, and whether surrounding parcels will be likely to request similar reconsiderations.
Commissioners, staff, County Counsel, Public Works	Discuss CC&R's and approval steps that will have to take place after today, and effect if amendments to CC&R's are needed. Requirements under such circumstances are discussed. Road standards, the private road, fire safety standards, that compliance with current standards will be required for the part in new construction.
Greg Wicker, agent	Introduces himself, stating he is available to answer questions.
Commissioners and agent	Discuss size of building envelope, that the building envelope incorporates part of the road, which was done on the original drawings. The distance between the existing residence and proposed secondary residence is considered. Further, that applicant is aware that changes will be required to CC&R's and that HOA has already approved the concept.
John Belcher	States he represents the Chicetti family. States the drainage from the proposed project would run to this family's property. States the area proposed for the project is a low lying area that floods during rains. It is part of the open space that was

L-8

	part of the original subdivision. States parcel 1 has sufficient room for a secondary dwelling. States the septic field should be moved so the secondary dwelling can be relocated. Original approval requires screening of secondary dwelling units. States no drainage plan was prepared in 1990, although the stock conditions say no septic shall be within 100 feet of a drainage swale. States he does not know how that can be done on this property. Distributes photographs. Discusses the creek, stating it is a blueline stream, and the map being displayed does not adequately locate the stream. Discusses details regarding drainage and flooding, percolation, that the distance between the primary and secondary dwellings is not known. Discusses the negative declaration, and uncertainty regarding archeology, stating the area is well known to have been Chumash territory. States no reconsideration is required for this project and urges denial.
Mr. George Chicetti	States he represents the Chicetti family, whose concerns are drainage and the blueline creek which drains into Arroyo Grande Creek. Describes water movement during rains.
Greg Whitmore, agent	States the area in question is currently 3 feet above the road level. States there is nothing in any paperwork he has seen that states it is open space. The septic system is well within the requirements as far as how far it is from the stream.
Commissioners, Public Works, County Counsel and staff	Discuss the private road, secondary dwelling units, consistency of the request with limitations on distances, the existing building envelope and whether a secondary dwelling could be placed there, original findings made in subdivision approval in 1990, whether this project is consistent with the original subdivision, whether homeowners in the area also wish to expand their building envelopes, drainage, that a drainage plan will be required by Public Works, whether there is room for a leach system if a building site were placed as requested, whether this application is consistent with the original approval. Findings required for denial are discussed.
MOTION	<p>Thereafter, a tentative motion by Commissioner Rappa, seconded by Commissioner Christie, to deny the application is discussed. Thereafter, motion maker and second amend their motion, and motion by Commissioner Rappa, seconded by Commissioner Christie, carries unanimously, to deny the project proposed by THOMAS AND DORIE ZWINGER, based on the following Findings:</p> <p><u>"Environmental Determination</u></p> <p>"A. That this project is found to be statutorily exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act under the provisions of Public Resources Code section 21080(b)(5), and Guidelines Section 15042, which provides that CEQA does not apply to projects which a public agency rejects or disapproves.</p> <p><u>"Reconsideration</u></p> <p>"B. The modification of the building site is inconsistent with the character and intent of the original tract map approval for the following reasons:</p> <p>"1. The site will not act to create a residential density compatible with the existing rural character and lifestyle,</p> <p>"2. The site will not act to create a visual buffer between the crop fields to the east and the residential development to the west,</p> <p>"3. The site will not buffer the existing farm fields."</p>
4. DAVID SCHFFFF	This being the time set for hearing to consider a proposal by DAVID SCHEEFF for a

SUB2004-00155	reconsideration of the conditions of approval for Tract 1694 to relocate the building envelope on Lot 6 to allow for the construction of a single family residence and leach field area. The amount of site disturbance will be approximately 43,300 square feet. The project is located on the east side of Earhart Road, via a private easement, approximately 2,000 feet northwest of Old Oak Park Road, north of the City of Arroyo Grande, in the San Luis Bay (Inland) Planning Area. Also to be considered at the hearing will be approval of the Negative Declaration prepared for the item pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., and CA Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.. Mitigation measures are proposed to address Biological Resources, Geology, Public Services and Utilities, and Wastewater. County File No: SUB2004-00155. APN: 044-562-006. Supervisorial District: 4.
Stephanie Fuhs, staff	States no relocation of the building envelope is requested. Describes the proposal. States at the time of site disturbance only very limited surveys were desired. With additional surveys and reports, additional site disturbance could be allowed. Recommends adoption of the negative declaration and approval of the project.
Commissioner Roos	Requests clarification of the original 10,000 square foot limitation, with staff responding.
Commissioner Christie	Requests clarification of size of house, with staff responding drawings have not been done yet, but the expectation is that it will be 3,000 to 4,000 square feet. Driveway is discussed, as well as other parcels in the area, and construction that has already taken place.
David Scheeff, applicant	Clarifies question regarding steep and hilly slopes, stating the steep, hilly part is outside the building envelope. Requests approval as submitted.
Commissioner Roos	Requests information from applicant regarding slope where he intends to build, with applicant responding.
Commissioner Christie	Requests clarification of the site plan, showing the original building envelope. Requests applicant define the site disturbance area, with applicant responding.
Public Testimony	No one coming forward.
David Scheeff, applicant	Requests approval.
MOTION	Thereafter, motion by Commissioner Mehlschau, seconded by Commissioner Rappa, is unanimously carried, to adopt the mitigated Negative Declaration in accordance with the applicable provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq., and RESOLUTION NO. 2005-015 granting reconsideration of conditions of approval to DAVID SCHEEFF for Tract 1694, and directing an amendment to mitigations be prepared, based on Findings listed in Exhibit A and subject to the Conditions in Exhibit B, adopted.
5. Consideration of letter to Board of Supervisors regarding Transfer Development Credits	This being the time set for continued consideration of a letter to the Board of Supervisors recommending TDC program changes.
Karen Nall, staff	States the letter is requested to be considered for recommendation to Board of Supervisors regarding TDC's.
Commissioner Roos	Reads a suggested introductory paragraph into the record and suggests further change to text.

L-10

Commissioner Mehlschau	Discusses clarification of whether or not this action would modify the existing ordinance, and in item 3, to supply some stronger criteria for the Board's consideration. Discusses item 6.
Commissioner Rappa	Discusses other programs that have succeeded and why, and states supervisors should be encouraged to initiate and complete discussions with incorporated areas. States she will not support this letter.
Maria Lorca, Creston Citizens for Ag Land Preservation	Thanks Commission. States she also speaks for other groups and individuals who could not be here today. Requests approval of the letter with the changes just made.
Dorothy Jennings, Chair of TAAG	Thanks Commission for taking TAAG comments to heart and for having this study session. States she supports the changes made today.
Chairperson Liberto-Blanck	Comments on TDC program generally.
MOTION	Thereafter, motion by Commissioner Roos, seconded by Commissioner Christie, carries, with Commissioner Rappa voting no, to direct staff to prepare a letter to the Board of Supervisors, as considered today, with the following changes: including an introductory paragraph to the letter considered today, as follows: "The Planning Commission has received testimony from several citizens and advisory council representatives during public comment that there were problems with the TDC program. As a result of that testimony the Planning Commission scheduled a study session on the TDC program and came to the following conclusions:"; changing "land" to "Land" in line 1, and revising to #6 by replacing "limiting" with "requiring" and by deleting "only" at the end of the sentence.
MOTION	Thereafter, motion by Commissioner Roos, seconded by Commissioner Mehlschau, carries unanimously, to take into the record all documents submitted today.
ADJOURNMENT	

Respectfully submitted,
Lona Franklin, Secretary
County Planning Commission